(MR. SPEAKER.)

The purpose underlying the prohibition of such questions is clearly to prevent any questions being asked in relation to a matter which is before a Court and is therefore likely either directly or indirectly to prejudice a case under trial.

It therefore follows that unless a court has taken cognisance of a matter, it would not become '*sub judice*' and the prohibition in Rule 26 (2) (p) would not apply. The filing of a First Information Report or of other steps taken prior to the filing of a charge-sheet or prior to a court taking cognisance of a matter would not make a matter *sub judice*. Of course, each such point of order has to be decided on its merits and a ruling can be given only on the facts and circumstances of each case.

There are a number of rulings and the point is not therefore lacking in authority. But on this occasion and in view of the clear wording of our Rules of Procedure, it is unnecessary to refer to any of them.

Statement of objects and reasons with reference to an amended Bill.

MR. SPEAKER.—During the October Session of last year, when the Cattle Trespass Bill as passed by the Legislative Council was proposed to be discussed on the motion for consideration, some members objected on the ground that the Statement of Objects and Reasons accompanying the Bill bore no relation to the Bill. I gave a ruling on that occasion to the effect that the Bill was not being introduced in the Assembly for the first time and that therefore, strictly it was not necessary for a Statement of Objects and Reasons to accompany the Bill I stated that our practice was however to permit the Bill together with the Statement of Objects and Reasons as originally appended to the Bill in order to give the Members of the House an idea of the purposes underlying the Bill when it was first introduced in the other House. I also stated that I would get this question examined again.

I find that the practice in different legislatures differs. But in view of the objection taken, I have made arrangements, from this Session onwards, to see that where a Bill which is passed by the Legislative Council is thereafter taken up in this House, the copies of the Bill to be distributed among the Members will not carry any Statement of Objects and Reasons. Only the Bill as finally passed by the Legislative Council will be printed and supplied to the Members. However, in order that the Members may have some idea of the objects underlying the Bill when it was first introduced in the other House, I have, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Legislative Council, arranged that copies of Bills introduced in one House will be made available to the Members of the other House also.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE.

Re : Central assistance to Shimsha Extension Scheme.

MR. SPEAKER.— The Minister for Agriculture wants to make a statement, He may do so now.

DR. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—(Minister for Agriculture).—With permission of the Hon'ble Speaker, I rise to make the following statement :—

It may be recalled that on the concluding day of the previous session of the House, I replied in the affirmative to a supplementary question under Question No. 322 put by Hon'ble member Sri M. V. Rama Rao as to whether Central assistance of Rs. 150 lakhs had been given to the State for executing the Shimsha Extension Scheme. I regret that a mistake occurred in furnishing this answer. As the question came up at a very late stage of the session there was no time for me to place the correct position before the House. I am therefore taking the earliest opportunity of doing so.

2. The Shimsha Extension Project is one of the schemes included in the Five-Year Plan and is estimated to cost about Rs. 345 lakhs. The question of executing the Project has been under correspondence with the Planning

nission for a considerable time The work could not be started ant of concurrence from the Com- on. Preliminary surveys were ver commenced in 1951-52 and nued in the following years, and penditure of Rs. 78,216 had been red up to the end of 1953-54 on account. In the year 1953-54, a provision of Rs. 1 lakh was made e Budget to enable commencement e work, in the expectation that the ning Commission would approve of Project. This provision was not ed for the reason already men- d. During the current year, her token provision of Rs. 5 lakhs been made, and even this remains ilised. I am placing on the table he House a statement for the period 1-52 to 1953-54 giving the following iculars :—

) Provision in the Budget on unt of Capital Outlay on Electri- Schemes.

(2) Provision out of the above in respect of the Shimsha Extension Project, and

(3) Amount of Central assistance given for Electricity Schemes in the State under the Five-Year Plan and the purpose for which it was given.

3. It will be clear from this statement that no earmarked Central assistance was given during any of these years for the actual execution of the Shimsha Extension Project. The assistance received has been applied only to the purposes for which it was given. Central assistance for the current year also has been received in respect of Electricity Schemes, but its allocation among the different items of work is still under correspondence with the Government of India.

4. I hope that with this clarification any impression that might have arisen of Central assistance given for Shimsha Extension Project having been utilised for other purposes will be removed.

tatement showing the capital grant and the amount of Loan assistance from Government of India for Electricity Schemes.

(In lakhs of Rupees)

ear	Capital grant for Electricity Schemes as provided in the Budget	Provision for Shimsha Expansion and Survey	Expenditure incurred on Shimsha Extension	Amount of loan assistance from Government of India
1-52	355.84	Nil	0.23 (Surveys)	150.00 *
2-53	185.00	0.40	0.50 (Surveys)	100.00 †
3-54	150.00	1.00	0.05 (Surveys)	50.00 ‡
		0.10 (Surveys)		
			0.78	

nes of Works for which Central assistance was given.—

1951-52

*(i) Mahatma Gandhi Hydro Electric Works.
(ii) Frequency Conversion Scheme
(iii) Extension of Transmission Lines.
(iv) Power Supply to Towns and Villages.
(v) Other Capital Works (Extension of Step Down Station).
(vi) Shimsha Extension (Surveys).
(vii) Normal Works in progress.
(viii) Surveys and Projects.

1952-53

†(i) Normal Works.
(ii) Mahatma Gandhi Hydro-Electric Works.
(iii) Frequency Conversion Scheme.
(iv) Transmission Lines.
(v) Step Down Station.
(vi) Distribution.
(vii) Surveys of Projects.

1953-54

‡(i) Transmission Lines.
(ii) Power Supply to Towns and Villages

Business of the House

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).- Sir, I want to say something regarding the programme for the entire Session. I would request the Chair to consider two or three aspects. For the debate on the Rajpramukh's Address, only two days are allotted. My desire and the desire of this House also is that two days are insufficient, and that it may be extended by another day. Two days to discuss the Motion of Thanks and also the amendments are hardly sufficient. Again, for the discussion on the Budget, three days are allotted, as usual. It is our experience that three days are very inadequate. We find that at the close of these three days, there will be a rush of members to take part in the discussion. Members cannot do full justice in discussing the Budget. Last time also, I had pleaded that the three days might be extended to five days, as three days were insufficient. This may be considered. Similarly again, two days have been set apart for the discussion on the Fact-Finding Committee Report. That is an important subject and I do not know what turn it will take. I am anxious that Members who take part must have their full say without restriction of time. I suggest that these two days also may be extended. Regarding recess, perhaps in consultation with Government, the Speaker has allotted three days. Perhaps this corresponds to Ugadi. Last year, there was a good deal of confusion. For the Ugadi, at least three clear days should be allowed for the Members to stay with their families. The first day is for *Bevubella*, the second day for *Holige* and the third day for *Kari*. (*Laughter.*) So I request the Chair to be generous to permit us to stay for another day. One day earlier—(looking into the programme) in fact, there is no holiday at all. Sunday.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—One day is given.

Sri. J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Monday also should be given as a holiday, Sir. We are spending more than a month at Bangalore. Should we not have one or two days more to go home and stay with our families ? That also may be considered. I request that these four points may be considered by the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In consultation.....

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Sir, I have something to say...

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Leader of the House).—Sir, these things are done more informally. It is not appropriate to take up the time of the House for these matters.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Sir, it is only after the question-hour that we are entitled to point out certain suggestions for the consideration of the Speaker. After the general discussion on the Budget, you have allotted 12 days for the Voting of Demands. We have been pressing that 12 days are insufficient. For this purpose 15 days may be allotted so that we may do justice for Voting of Demands. Another point is, you have allotted little time for the discussion of Bills. Very important Bills are going to come up before this House. I feel that more time should be allotted for that purpose also.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We shall not waste our time. As the Leader of the House has observed, we can meet informally, discuss these matters and come to a decision. But we should keep one point in view: we have to pass the Budget before the 31st of next month.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—That can be done, Sir.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA (Sagar-Hosanagar).— Sir, I had given notice of an adjournment motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That has been received after the due time. We will consider it tomorrow.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—Sir, I beg to lay on the table :

The Finance Accounts 1951-52 and Audit Report 1952 and the

Appropriation Accounts, 1951-52 and Audit Report, 1953.

The list of promises made by Government during the previous sessions and action taken thereon.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table:

The Mysore Essential Articles (Temporary Powers) Ordinance, 1955.

Copies of Notifications Nos. T. 2511—R. T. 158-53-18, dated 17th August 1954 and T. 3140-R. T. 124-53-6, dated 21st September 1954 issued under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939.

Copy of Notification No. I. 3151—Ind. 7-54-4, dated 13th November 1954, issued under the Mysore State Aid to Industries Act, 1951.

---

1 P.M.

Chair's observation *re.* Notifications laid on the Table.

Mr. SPEAKER.—According to section 183 (2) of the Motor Vehicles Act 1939, all rules made under this Act, shall come into force, in the absence of any appointed date, from the date of publication in the Gazette. Section 133 (3) requires that the rules should also be laid by the State Government before the Legislature for a period of not less than fourteen days, as soon as possible after they are made, and the Assembly is further given the power to modify them during the session in which they are so laid.

Two notifications have been recently issued, one on the 17th August 1954 and the other on the 21st September 1954. As members are aware, there was a session of the Assembly in the month of October 1954 and it was the duty of Government to have caused those rules to be laid during that session. Without going into the question of the effect of delay in laying the rules on the table as soon as possible, I may state that such delay would amount to a serious curtailment of the rights of the members of the House. In this connection, I may bring to the notice of the House that this is the second time that reference has had to be made to such delay. On a previous occasion in connection with the laying of notifications issued under the Cattle Trespass Act my predecessor in office has made similar observations. I hope that the Government will follow the provisions of the Acts more strictly in future. I may add that when their attention was drawn to this delay, Government have stated that care would be taken to see that such delay is avoided in future.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—When shall we have the opportunity to discuss these rules framed under the Motor Vehicles Act and our opinions ascertained? I do not find mention of it in the list of business. We would like to offer our views on the Rules framed and so time may be set apart for that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Under the Rules of Procedure, if you want to discuss the rules, you will have to send in amendments and they will be placed before the House for consideration when they can be discussed. So, any amendments to these Rules may be placed before the House and then time will be allotted for the discussion of those amendments. Otherwise, it will be taken that the House will have approved the rules as a whole.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I think copies of these rules may be supplied to Members.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They have been laid on the table.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Copies of such important rules may be distributed to the Members.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think the rules will be published in the Gazette and copies supplied to every Hon'ble Member of this House.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Leader of the House).—Apparently he is not reading the Gazette! (*Laughter*).

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sometimes it is very interesting; sometimes it is insipid.

MYSORE CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954.

Presentation of Joint Select Committee Report.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries on behalf of Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao—Member Joint Select Committee).—Sir, I beg to present the report of the Joint Select Committee on the Mysore Co-operative Societies (Amendment) Bill, 1954.

Address of His Highness the Rajpramukh on Saturday, the 19th February 1955.

MEMBERS OF THE MYSORE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND THE MYSORE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,

IT gives me great pleasure to exercise the privilege of addressing you at the commencement of the first session of the Legislature in the year 1955. I extend a warm welcome to you all and, in particular, to the new members of the Legislative Council and to those members of the Legislative Assembly who have been returned in the bye-elections in the course of the past year.

Before proceeding to state the important problems that will be placed before you for consideration, I desire to place on record my deep sense of grief on the demise of Shri H. Siddaiya who was holding the high office of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. In him the State has lost a great patriot and an able statesman.